III - 1

```
1
                         UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
                       EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
 2
                           SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION
 3
      JORDAN BLAIR,
 4
                Plaintiff,
 5
                                          No. 1:02-CV-88 CAS
           VS.
 6
      BOB WILLS, ET AL.,
 7
                Defendants.
 8
                         TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL
 9
                   BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHARLES A. SHAW
10
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
                               April 14, 2004
11
                                Volume III
12
13
      APPEARANCES:
14
      For Plaintiff:
                           Mr. Oscar Stilley
                           511 Rogers Avenue
                           Central Mall Plaza, Suite 520
15
                           Fort Smith, AR 72903
16
      For Defendants:
                           Mr. John L. Oliver, Jr.
17
                           OLIVER, OLIVER & WALTZ
                           400 Broadway, P.O. Box 559
18
                           Cape Girardeau, MO 63702
19
                           Mr. John D. Briggs
                           BROWN AND JAMES
20
                           1010 Market Street, 20th Floor
                           St. Louis, MO 63101
21
      REPORTED BY:
                           SUSAN R. MORAN, RMR
22
                           Official Court Reporter
                           111 South 10th Street
23
                           St. Louis, MO 63102
                           (314) 244-7983
24
      Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, produced by
25
      computer-aided transcription.
```

III - 2

```
1
                                    INDEX
 2
 3
       INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY
 4
                                                  4
            (By the Court)
 5
       CLOSING ARGUMENTS
 6
                                                  9
            (By Mr. Stilley)
 7
            (By Mr. Oliver)
                                                 11
                                                 19
            (By Mr. Stilley)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
(The following proceedings were held outside the
 1
 2
      hearing of the jury on April 14, 2004 at 9:12 a.m.:)
 3
               THE COURT: Good morning. Are you all satisfied
 4
      with the instructions and verdict form?
 5
               MR. STILLEY: Yes, Your Honor, for the plaintiff.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay.
 7
               MR. OLIVER: Yes, sir. I hope we did it to your
 8
      satisfaction.
 9
               THE COURT: It looks good to me. Fine.
10
               Now, I'm inclined to read the instructions first.
11
      That's normally the state procedure. Many times in federal
12
      court the instructions are read last, but I'm inclined to go
13
      ahead and read these instructions in case you want to argue
14
      them or use them in some kind of way. So that's my
15
      inclination to read these first. Any objection to that?
16
               MR. STILLEY: None, Your Honor.
17
               MR. OLIVER: No, sir, I like it that way.
18
               THE COURT: Yeah, I think it's better. If you so
19
      desire, you can argue what they are. Okay. Let's bring the
20
      jury out.
21
               MR. OLIVER: Your Honor, I'd again ask, respectfully
22
      remind the Court that maybe the Court might say something to
23
      the jury about the absence of the Fair Labor Standard Act.
24
      I'm sure both of us will mention it, but they might believe
25
      it better from Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Yes, I'll mention it.

2.0

(The following proceedings continued within the hearing of the jury:)

THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. We're now going to enter the instruction and closing argument phase of this case. And the Fair Labor Standards Act portion of the case has been resolved. So the only remaining issue will be the plaintiff's battery claim. And so that will be what will be addressed by counsel in their argument, and that will be the remaining issue for you to make a decision upon.

So the instructions: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, the instructions that I gave at the beginning of the trial and during the trial remain in effect. I now give you additional instructions. Of course you must continue to follow the instructions which were given earlier as well as those that I give now. You must not single out some instructions and ignore others because all are equally important. This is true even though some of those I gave at the beginning of the trial or during the trial are not repeated here.

The instructions I'm giving you now are in writing and will be available to you in your jury room. I emphasize, however, that this does not mean that they are more important than the earlier instructions. And, again, all instructions

whenever given and whether in writing or not must be followed.

Neither in these instructions nor in any ruling, action, or remark that I have made during the course of this trial have I intended to give any opinion or suggestion as to what your verdict should be. That is entirely up to you. If I've occasionally made statements or asked questions, do not assume that because I made statements or asked questions that I hold any opinion on these matters. The answers to these questions or what your verdict should be.

In deciding what the facts are, you will have to decide what testimony you believe and what testimony you do not believe. You may believe all of what a witness has said, only part of it, or none of it. In deciding what testimony to believe, you may consider the witnesses' intelligence, their opportunity to have seen or heard the things testified about, the witness' memory, any motives the witness may have for testifying a certain way, the manner of the witness while testifying, whether the witness said something different at an earlier time, the reasonableness of the testimony, and the extent to which the testimony is consistent with any evidence that you believe.

In deciding whether or not to believe a witness, keep in mind that sometimes people hear and see things differently and sometimes forget things. You need to

consider, therefore, whether a contradiction is an innocent misrecollection or a lapse of memory or an intentional falsehood. And that may depend upon whether it has to do with an important fact or only a small detail.

In these instructions you're told that your verdict depends on whether you find certain facts have been proved.

The burden of proving a fact is upon the party whose claim or defense depends upon that fact. The party who has the burden of proving a fact must prove it by the greater weight or preponderance of the evidence.

To prove something by the greater weight or preponderance of the evidence is to prove that it is more likely true than not true. It is determined by considering all of the evidence and deciding which evidence is more believable. If on any issue in the case the evidence is equally balanced, you cannot find that issue has been proved. The greater weight or preponderance of the evidence is not necessarily determined by the greater number of witnesses or exhibits a party has presented. You may have heard the term proof beyond a reasonable doubt. That is a stricter standard which applies in criminal cases. It does not apply in civil cases such as this. You should, therefore, put it out of your minds.

Your verdict must be for plaintiff if you believe:

First -- and the only remaining defendant in this case is Bo

Gerhardt, so let me say that also. Your verdict must be for plaintiff if you believe defendant intentionally pushed plaintiff. And second, defendant thereby caused a contact with the plaintiff which was offensive to plaintiff. And third, such contact would be offensive to a reasonable person.

If you find in favor of Plaintiff Jordan Blair and against Defendant Bo Gerhardt, then you must award Jordan Blair such sum as you believe will fairly and justly compensate Jordan Blair for damage you believe Jordan Blair sustained as a direct result of the occurrences mentioned in the evidence.

In conducting your deliberations and returning a verdict, there's certain rules that you must follow. First, when you go to your jury room you must select one of your members to act as your foreperson. That person will preside over your discussions and speak for you here in court.

Second, it is your duty as jurors to discuss this case with one another in your jury room. You should try to reach agreement if you can do so without violence to individual judgment because your verdict must be unanimous.

Each of you must make your own conscientious decision, but only after you have considered all of the evidence, discussed it fully with your fellow jurors, and listened to the views of your fellow jurors. Do not be

afraid to change your opinions if the discussion persuades you that you should, but do not come to a decision simply because the other jurors think that it is right or simply to reach a verdict. Remember at all times that you are not partisans, you are judges, judges of the facts. Your sole interest is to seek the truth from the evidence in the case.

Third, if you need to communicate with me during your deliberations you may send a note to me through the marshal or bailiff signed by one or more of you jurors and I'll respond as soon as possible either in writing or orally here in open court.

Remember that you should not tell anyone including me how your votes stand numerically. Your verdict must be based solely on the evidence and the law which has been given in the instructions. Your verdict must be unanimous.

Nothing that I have a said or done is intended to suggest what your verdict should be. That is entirely up to you to decide.

Finally, the verdict form is the notice of the decision that you reach in the case. And you will take this verdict -- form of verdict with you to your jury room and when each of you have agreed upon a verdict, your foreperson will fill in the verdict form, sign it, and date it and advise the marshal or bailiff that you're ready to return to the courtroom. And you will return these -- these to the

courtroom with any instructions or other materials that you may have.

We're now going to commence with the closing arguments. Okay. Mr. Stilley, you ready?

MR. STILLEY: Thank you, Judge. May it please the Court, counsel, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. Thank you very much for your patience and kind attention in this case. I know this has taken a little bit longer than you might expect for something of this nature. At this point in time the only surviving claim for your consideration turns on the credibility of witnesses.

We've got the defendant, Bo Gerhardt, saying that he did not commit any battery. And we've got another defendant, Drew Parrish, who says I was there and I didn't see it happen. And we've got the plaintiff saying this happened to me.

Let's think about this. The plaintiff stated that he was slammed up against a sink and it hurt overnight. He didn't say it injured my back and I was hurt for a long time. He didn't make a big story. He didn't say that anybody else hit him. If somebody was going to lie, would they make a lie of that nature with that sort of a story? This story has all the earmarks of the truth.

As a matter of fact, in order to explain, even to try to let you understand why did he ask for compensation for

that, I allowed him to explain what's the difference between this hit and a hit that you take on the football field. He didn't tell you, well, that was a lot harder than any of the hits I took on the football field. He said on the football field there are rules. And basically -- he didn't say all this, but basically what he's saying is I know what causes you to get hit. I know how you keep from getting hit. At Mountain Park concerning this incident of battery, I didn't know what caused me to get hit, and I didn't have any way to understand the rules.

The defendants themselves say we give the parents a student handbook to the parents. We don't give it to the students.

And now, as far as physical injury, what he said was it hurt overnight. That's all he said. He said as far as mental and emotional distress, what that caused him to do was be fearful of anything he did because he didn't know what would cause further injury to him.

And I'd respectfully submit to you that on the basis of this when you consider these competing stories that you should give credit to Jordan Blair's story and award him as the Court said fair and just compensation. And I'm willing and more than happy to leave that to you to let you decide what is the sense of this community as to what is fair and just compensation for an injury of this nature. Thank you so

much for your time.

MR. OLIVER: May it please the Court.

THE COURT: Mr. Oliver.

MR. OLIVER: Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Stilley,
Mr. Blair. The last three days the eight of you have had an
opportunity to participate in something that's unique to the
United States, and that's our jury system. This the only
country in the world that it had enough sense to entrust
decision making to our citizens. We have an opportunity,
small opportunities to participate in our democracy. We have
an opportunity to vote. We have an opportunity from time to
time to serve in the armed forces. We have numerous
charitable opportunities.

One of the opportunities that we forget about because it's an inconvenience is jury duty. In our system, it's a system that has lasted for over 200 years, takes good citizens who by reason of their background, education, and experience bring a wealth of knowledge and we let those people, you, decide disputes.

You know, they used to do this in England, each side would go out and hire a champion and the person that had the most resources, the fanciest tools, they would hire the biggest champion and get on the biggest horse, and if the defendants didn't have or the defendant didn't have that kind of money or that big horse, you know, you've all seen the

Prince Valient movies, that's really how they did it, each champion galloped down the road on the horse, and the biggest and strongest always won. That didn't always produce the right result.

So we have a jury system, and we believe in that system. And that's why we're here because we trust you to hear the evidence and to do what the judge has indicated is your duty, and that's to decide the facts based on what he has told you the law is.

Bo in particular is grateful for your service. I'm grateful for your service. I'm an officer of the court. Without you we don't function. Without you we are not a democracy. We appreciate your time.

I also understand in this case some of the difficulty you've had because you heard two days and all this stuff about Fair Labor Standards Act, which is now not for your decision. The judge has decided that as a matter of law. So the only thing that that evidence matters to you is as it relates to the credibility of the witnesses, particularly Drew Parrish and Bo as relates to what actually happened on October the 24th. And then the rest of the reasons as it bears on who was telling the truth and why.

You know, this lawsuit started a long time before we got here today, before you were sworn in on Monday. Mountain Park, which employs Bo, takes troubled youth, troubled youth.

We have a form that indicates for every potential applicant what their problems are. We ask a series of things, what are their behavior problems, drug or alcohol, sexual activity, runaway, wrong friends, failing school, rebellion, disrespect, out of control behavior disorders.

Now, what Jordan's problems were are not part of this case. What Jordan's problems are are not part of the case. But when his parents in the exercise of their parental judgment got worried enough to turn to the institution of last resort starting in October 19th of 2000, it was because Jordan was troubled. It was -- it was because Jordan was in difficulty in a residential placement facility. It was the last resort.

And when his parents came on October the 20th and enrolled him, it was because of that. They are the ones that were trying to live with him and could not. And on October the 24th he came to Mountain Park, what his parents thought would be his choice. And how did he describe that he came? He came in handcuffs, not handcuffs that we put on, not handcuffs his parents put on.

Yet when he came he was greeted by Drew, Drew
Parrish, who remembers it because of that. He's greeted by
Drew on the 24th. Who is Drew Parrish? Drew Parrish is a
product of Mountain Park. Three years there, junior staff,
staff, is no longer employed. He's pursuing his education at

Crown Bible College. Where is Crown College? Knoxville,
Tennessee. He drove from Knoxville, Tennessee to here
yesterday when Jordan identified him as a witness. Why did
he drive all the way across the state of Tennessee in to
Missouri? Well, one time he was a defendant in this case but
not in the battery part. But he came from bible college here
so that the eight of you would know the truth, so that the
eight of you would know what happened.

So what did happen? Jordan comes in handcuffs just like we told you. The handcuffs were removed. Jordan and Matt Elmore -- Drew and Matt Elmore then take Jordan into the dorm and downstairs and sit him on the couch. Matt Elmore, former student. You've heard from former students. Where is Matt Elmore? If this was true, if Matt Elmore witnessed this, don't you think that they would have Matt Elmore sitting out there and you would have heard from Matt Elmore? Don't know. You didn't.

So they take him downstairs. They sit him on the couch. Talk to him, start explaining things to him. Bo comes in. That's part of his job. He comes in. He talks to them. And what happens at that point in time? The boy is like every other young man who comes, given soap and a towel and told to go take a shower. That's the way you start.

Object No. 1, take a shower. That's the first step.

And Mr. Stilley and Mr. Blair between the two of

them, they can't even get straight what their story is.

You'll recall, I wrote it down. Mr. Stilley told you in

opening statement that Bo slammed him. Jordan wasn't willing

to go quite that far, so Jordan had him shoved. Mr. Stilley

wants to make it a slam again this morning. Pejorative

adjectives, attack words. Attack words like indoctrination.

So what happened? Bo -- did Bo -- did Bo push and shove him, offensively touch him? You notice the instruction they submitted says offensive touching. It did not happen.

And why do I know it did not happen? It did not happen because Bo said it didn't happen. And Drew Parrish drove here from bible college to tell you that it didn't happen.

And what did Drew Parrish tell you, if he saw it, he would have reported it. Why? Because they believe.

Know the truth and the truth will set you free.

They believe. This is a fundamental independent Baptist institution. They believe. They operate to save children based on this belief. And they don't need to make things up.

If Bo makes a mistake, Drew would have corrected him by reporting it. It didn't happen.

The judge has told you in Instruction No. 3 that you're the sole judge of the credibility of the witnesses.

And you need to ask yourself or you will ask yourself why would this young man and his attorney if they can get their stories straight about what happened, why did they say, why

did they do? Well, let's just look at motives. What's the root of all evil. Money is the root of all evil. The love of money is the root of all evil. Money is an obvious objective. Why would you say something to get money? Is that the real reason? I sort of doubt it. I sort of doubt it. What kind of person has a lawyer that stands up in opening statement and starts out by saying this is not a case about religion, I'm a Baptist, Bo -- Jordan is a Baptist, and he's a born again Christian, and then has his client get on the stand and say he's nondenominational, and having said that he's nondenominational calls church indoctrination.

Think about that for a minute. Church in this courtroom is indoctrination. It's important.

But why do you have a slick political correctness type of attack where teaching religion and exposing a child to the wishes of their parents becomes indoctrination? When you have those kind of things, you have those kind of things when you want to get, even when you want to retaliate against somebody. Why would you want to retaliate? Well, let's think about this for a minute. Jordan's parents put him there. He didn't want to be there. They put him from whatever troubled environment he was in into a rigid environment, a strict environment. Rule No. 1, get up; Rule No. 2, brush your teeth; Rule No. 3, clean yourself; Rule No. 4, make your bed; Rule No. 5, clean up after yourself.

All the things that all of us that have children wish our own kids did.

But from a troubled structure to a rigid, one, two, three, four, five, a rigid structure. He doesn't want to be there. He resents his parents. He resents the situation. He resents the discipline. He resents the structure. Why does he pick on Bo? Why does he pick on Bo? Well, I want to suggest why he picks on Bo. Because Bo didn't touch him. Bo didn't slam him. Bo didn't shove him. Bo didn't push him. What did Bo do that leads to this lawsuit? What Bo did was administer the diagnostic test.

You remember Brother Sam explained that and Bo explained and Brother O'Brient explained that when you have your academics, that what you do is they give you a diagnostic test to see where your level is, and then they start you at that level. Well, according to Bo after his diagnostic test he had to start out at the fifth grade level. When he got around to writing his parents, it was the 11th grade and repeat his junior year.

But ladies and gentlemen, you know what stuck in this young man's crawl, what stuck in this young man's crawl and why we're really here today besides all these collateral motivations, the money, the structure, the rebellion, the handcuffs, besides all those things, you know why we're here today? Because he had to do remedial work as a result of the

test that Bo Gerhardt administered.

2.0

And that's eating at this guy. It's in his letters. Twenty-eight letters. I can't graduate this year. I'm not going to be able to go to graduation. I have to repeat the 11th grade. Fifth grade remedial work. He took the test, he didn't do well. Bo administered the test. It's the only explanation that I can think of.

THE COURT: Two minutes, Counsel.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Ladies and gentlemen, you and you alone are the judge of credibility of these witnesses. Bo and Drew Parrish, the two witnesses that were identified by the plaintiff have told you the truth so help them God, the truth that they live and believe every day. They live their lives based on that truth. They did not, Bo Gerhardt did not push, shove, or offensively touch Jordan Blair on the 24th day of October 2001. This boy came a troubled boy in handcuffs. A troubled boy who had to have remedial education. A troubled boy who blames Bo Gerhardt for what his problems were.

When you go back into to the privacy of your jury room and deliberate, please, when you fill the verdict out, know the truth, and the truth is that your verdict must be for Bo Gerhardt because this battery did not happen. It didn't happen. They can't even describe it the same way. There is no indoctrination. There's no push. There's no

shove. There's only right truth and truth. And the truth is, the truth is like Drew Parrish told you and more importantly like Bo told you, this did not happen.

And we trust your judgment. We trust the oath that you took. And we know that after your deliberation you will do the right thing and return a verdict for Bo Gerhardt.

Thank you.

MR. STILLEY: Ladies and gentlemen, let me say this:

Even not saying anything about Jordan Blair, if any person

goes to jail, they are entitled to a copy of the rules. They

are entitled to know what gets you in trouble and what

doesn't. Even if you go to jail, you're still entitled to

the sanctity of your person. A jailer can't shove you or

push or however they want to say it or hit you without cause.

That is a violation of civil rights. It's not tolerated in

our society.

And there's a suggestion that, well, Drew Parrish was just identified here recently, so we had to call him from outside to come here. Well, he was identified as a defendant. There were depositions done in which the witnesses to this incident were identified. Surely they can't realistically say this came as a surprise to them. They knew about it.

There's a suggestion that this -- it's just about greed, this is about money. No, this is not about greed,

this is not about money. If Mr. Blair doesn't get \$2 for Tylenol or \$200,000, he was wronged. He doesn't like that. He doesn't think that's supposed to happen in our society, and he wants some accountability. He wants a judgment that that is wrong, that that is offensive contact. It's not tolerated in our society. And the amount of damages, whatever it is, that you find justly and reasonably compensates him for that wrong that he's suffered.

I don't recall saying that he was Baptist. I recall saying that he was a person of faith. And let me show you. You've got a number of letters here, and I'm sure you all know that when a person writes a number of letters or a great deal of handwriting of any sort, they reveal a little bit about themselves in more ways than one. And you can take a look at these. But if you need to take a look, those will tell you a lot about the story. You can learn about this if you come to a situation where you need to find things out because they're admitted into evidence, they are evidence in this case.

Exhibit 20 is an example of why the plaintiff would say that he was indoctrinated rather than provided the religious training that he expected. What did he say? He said, here are a few things I've learned, speaking in tongues is false doctrine. The Christian music I listen to is wicked. Our church is wicked. The music you sing is wicked.

Instruments they use are wicked. Drums, electric guitar is wicked, and the way they sing is wrong.

Now, does that sound like somebody that is just satisfied? Okay. I'm a Baptist, and I'm just going to do things -- well, just making a complaint lately, Johnnie come lately complaint about what's going on. Of course not. He complained to his parents. He told them what they were saying. And you can see on the back side of the letter that Bo Gerhardt says, "Call and I can help you respond." So the defendants can't say they didn't know about this. They did know about this. And when you look at the bottom, they want to make out that this person is not a Christian, is an unbeliever or something like that. Let's look what he asked for along with work boots. I need a pocket bible.

THE COURT: One minute, Counsel.

MR. STILLEY: Thank you, Judge. A person who was had no belief in Christian religion would not be asking for a bible. And as to the idea about this, the educational parts, you know, there's some things that are out of this case, but once again if you need to see what he said about his educational requirements, look in the letter or you can recall what he said from the stand about having completed the requirements of graduation.

Thank you very much for your attention.

THE COURT: Michelle, will you take the jury to a

III - 22

```
safe and secure place so they may commence their
 1
 2
      deliberations. Here are the last instructions and the
 3
      verdict form.
 4
               (Jury sent to deliberate at 9:43 a.m.)
 5
               (The following proceedings were held at 11 a.m.)
 6
               THE COURT: Good morning again, ladies and gentlemen
 7
      of the jury. I understand you all have reached a verdict.
 8
      Is that correct?
 9
               JUROR SWINEY: Yes.
10
               THE COURT: Clerk, publish the verdict, please.
               THE CLERK: On Plaintiff Jordan Blair's claims
11
12
      against Defendant Bo Gerhardt as submitted in Instruction
13
      No. 5, we find in favor of Jordan Blair. We find the
14
      Plaintiff Jordan Blair's damages to be $20,000. Signed by
15
      the foreperson this 14th day of April 2004.
               Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, is the verdict I
16
17
      have just read your true and correct verdict?
18
               THE JURORS: Yes.
19
               THE COURT: Does either party wish to have the jury
20
      further polled or individually polled?
21
               MR. OLIVER: No, sir.
22
               MR. STILLEY: No, Your Honor.
23
               THE COURT: Very well. Ladies and gentlemen of the
24
      jury, I want to thank you for your time, attention, and
25
      service. It's not an easy job being a juror. The admonition
```

III - 23

```
1
      is lifted. You can discuss this case as fully and freely
 2
      with anyone you choose.
 3
               We do have a rule within this federal court system,
 4
      the lawyers cannot inquire of you. If you want to talk to
 5
      them, that's up to you. You can talk to anyone you choose
 6
      about this case.
 7
               So thank you so much for your service. You're
 8
      excused.
9
               (Jury dismissed.)
10
               THE COURT: Anything else?
               MR. STILLEY: No, Your Honor.
11
12
               THE COURT: Thank you all so much.
13
               (Court in recess at 11:03 a.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, Susan R. Moran, Registered Merit Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the Eastern 3 4 District of Missouri, do hereby certify that I was present 5 at and reported in machine shorthand the proceedings in the 6 above-mentioned court; and that the foregoing transcript is 7 a true, correct, and complete transcript of my stenographic 8 notes. 9 I further certify that I am not attorney for, nor 10 employed by, nor related to any of the parties or attorneys in this action, nor financially interested in the action. 11 12 I further certify that this transcript contains 13 pages 1 - 24 and that this reporter takes no responsibility 14 for missing or damaged pages of this transcript when same 15 transcript is copied by any party other than this reporter. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 16 at St. Louis, Missouri, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of 17 \_\_\_\_\_, 2004. 18 19 20 /s/ Susan R. Moran Registered Merit Reporter 21 22 23 24

25